he can get for it to meet the pressing wants of the moment and thus by reducing the price prejudice the interests of other garden owners and the wholesale merchants who have bought and stored up large quantities for sale. By the abolition of Halat supari stealing would be facilitated. On the other hand garden owners have to spend large sums of money in cultivation and have besides to pay a heavy rate of assessment, and their supari is often attacked by rot ("Kolé Roga"); so that as a result of all these causes many of them are involved in heavy debt for which their gardens are mortgaged. If their condition is to be bettered, the rate of assessment must be reduced. The reduction will encourage them to cultivate waste lands and plant more gardens; whereby the loss to the Government by reduction in assessment on existing gardens will be compensated by additional revenue from new gardens. Such producers of supari as have preferred the abolition of the Halat duty have done so under the wrong impression that they would thereby be benefitted. Whereas the result would be otherwise as above explained.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao (Planter from Chikmagalur Municipality) remarked that the cases of tobacco and cardamoms were not parallel with that of supari in question, inasmuch as the latter was a speciality of this country and could command in the market all the existing price which the consumer could afford to give, whereas the former were grown and more successfully grown in other parts of the world.

Halat presses the cultivator who, by working hard, spending much and cultivating high, produces much. Whereas, it does not touch the lazy man who produces little or nothing. Those who are *Suttigedars*, want the Halat to be kept on. Cultivators wish it to be abolished. The earlier members of the Dasara Representative Assembly were *Suttigedars*. The latter have been cultivators. Hence the change in the views here advocated.

Dewan's reply.—The matter is, at present, under the consideration of Government.

Mr. Nadiga Sivappa (Land-holder from Sorab Taluk).

Subject No. 12. Village Munsiffs Bill.

Summary of discussion.—The proposed Village Munsiffs' Regulation should be passed early for the benefit of traders and others. It might be tried at least experimentally in some parts of the State. This would save the trouble of people going long distances to Munsiff's Courts for suing for small debts and incurring expenditure out of all proportion to the amount involved in the suit. *Per contra* it was urged that the introduction of the bill in question is opposed on the following grounds :—

(*a*) That factious spirit still plays the most important part in villages.

(*b*) That Patels are not sufficiently educated and cannot therefore be safely expected to exercise Judicial powers.

(*c*) It would multiply cases of false *alibi*, as these proceedings can easily be tampered with.

(*d*) It would vest in the Patels a power which may, in many instances, be used to the prejudice of powerless people.

(*e*) It would give scope for more compulsion being brought to bear upon the poorer classes to render personal service.

It is desirable that the bill should be postponed until such time as duly qualified men are available to be Village Munsiffs. And it is also desirable as a preliminary step to the introduction of the measure that a standard of examination for Village Munsiffship should be prescribed and thrown open only to men of proved and undoubted moral character and respectability.

Mr. Rangaiengar (Land-holder from Krishnarajpet) in advocating the introduction of the proposed measure observed that raiyats and merchants asked for it, while Pleaders and Lawyers objected to it.

Mr. Venkatakrishnaiya suggested that if the bill does not become law, the Government should help in establishing Courts of Conciliation as in Norway.

Dewan's reply.—The subject is still before Government and no decision has been arrived at.

Mr. Nadig Sivappa, Land-holder and R. M. from Sorab and Mr. Srirangachar, Inamdar and R. M. from T. Narsipur.

Subject No. 13.

Compulsory Registration of leases up to 3 years.

Summary of discussion.—Leases for terms under one year are exempt from registration under Section 17 of the Indian Registration Act. It is requested that leases for longer periods but under 5 years may also be exempted; such leases should also be exempt for stamp duty. It was suggested by another R. M. that at least leases executed for periods up to a limit of 3 years, may be exempted from registration.

Dewan's reply.—Inexpedient.

Mr. Kanur Ramachandraiya, Land-holder from Yedahalli Sub-Taluk.

Subject No. 14.

Saguvali Chits to be granted before 1st July.

Summary of discussion.—Applicants for ordinary dry and wet lands are not granted permission to enter into occupation till the opening of the new official year, *i. e.*, 1st July, by which time the monsoon will have set in and be approaching its climax, and long before which the lands should have been